

REMARKS

This response to office action is responsive to the Final Office Action mailed on June 1, 2007. Claims 1-20 are pending in the application. Applicant kindly thanks the Examiner for the allowance of Claims 18-20 and for acknowledging that Claims 1, 2-7, 9-11 and 17 are allowable. Claims 1-7, 9-15 and 17 have been rejected. Claim 1 has been amended. Claims 12-17 have been cancelled. The independent claim 1 has been amended similarly to the suggestion of the Examiner, thus claim 1 is now allowable. No new matter has been introduced by these amendments. Reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested in view of the amendments and the following remarks.

Rejection under 112, 1st paragraph

The claims 1-7, 9-11 and 17 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner has suggested amending the claim 1 to include an additional body having a third fork clamp and a fourth fork clamp for the ball clamp body to be insertable in one of the third or fourth clamps. Applicant has amended claim 1 to include similar claim language. Applicant believes that the amended claim language overcomes the 112 first paragraph rejection of claim 1. Thus claim 1 is now in a condition for allowance. Moreover, dependent claims 2-11 are also allowable, since claims 2-11 depend from allowable claim 1.

Rejection under 102(b)

The Examiner has rejected Claims 10-16 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Koch et al. (U.S. Patent No. 3,343,507). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to include allowable subject matter, thus claim 1 is now allowable. Thus, the rejection of claims 10-11 is now moot.

Claims 12-17 have been cancelled therefore, the rejection of claims 12-16 is now moot.

Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is therefore respectfully requested.


Further remarks regarding the asserted relationship between Applicant's claims and the prior art are not deemed necessary, in view of the foregoing discussion. Applicant's silence as to any of the Examiner's comments is not indicative of acquiescence to the stated grounds of rejection.

The cited art of record and not relied upon does not render the present invention anticipated or obvious.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of each of the claims is respectfully requested. If there are any remaining issues that need to be addressed in order to place this application into condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's representative.

Respectfully submitted,



Andrew D. Gathy

Reg. 46,441

P.O. Box 351

East Lyme, CT 06385

Attorney Docket No.: BURNS-001

Date: August 29, 2007